

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9-21, 24-26, 28, 29, 32-42, 45-47, and 49-58 have been rejected. Claims 3, 4, 8, 22, 23, 27, 30, 31, 43, 44, and 48 have been objected to. By this Amendment, claim 58 has been amended, and new claims 59-84 have been added. Thus, claims 1-84 are pending.

I. Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner indicated that the information disclosure statement submitted on 27 April 2006, 24 April 2008, and 5 May 2008 were in compliance with provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. However, Applicants note that the Examiner drew lines through certain of the documents listed on these information disclosure statements without clarifying why these documents will not be considered. Applicants submit, as the Examiner has stated in the Office Action, that these documents were submitted in compliance with provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Thus, Applicants request that these documents be considered or the Examiner provide clarification as to why they will not be considered.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 17-18, 20, 32, 34, 39-40, 57 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Halahmi (US 2003/0011631).

A. Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites judging whether or not the acquisition of definition information, which is information to be applied to the **entire page so as to render the page**, is finished.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cited to paragraphs [0017], [0045], and [0048] as disclosing the claim feature of judging whether or not the acquisition of definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page, is finished. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reading of Halahmi.

In particular, paragraph [0017] discloses dividing a document into portions, receiving at least one portion of the document by a display device, and then displaying the at least one portion. Thus, the document is divided into portions before it is received at the display device to be displayed. Paragraph [0017] does not disclose definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page. Moreover, paragraph [0017] makes no reference to judging whether such information has been acquired in displaying the at least one portion of the document.

Paragraphs [0045] and [0048] relate to the process of dividing a document into portions depicted in figure 2. (See paragraph [0012].) Paragraph [0045] relates to step 2 of this process in which at least one property of the wireless communication device is determined. (See paragraph [0044].) In particular, paragraph [0045] discloses the property to be determined can include various characteristics including lines per screen which may be displayed and the level of support provided by the microbrowser for CSS. Paragraph [0045] does not disclose definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page. Moreover, paragraph [0045] makes no reference to judging whether such information has been acquired in determining the property of the wireless communication device.

Paragraph [0048] relates to step 4 of the process of dividing a document into portions. In particular paragraph [0048] discloses examining a first delineated section of the document. Paragraph [0048] does not disclose definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page. Moreover, paragraph [0045] makes no reference to judging whether such information has been acquired in examining the first delineated section of the document.

Independent claim 1 also recites “switching onscreen presentation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen presentation in a text browsing mode to onscreen presentation in which the definition is applied.”

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cited to paragraphs [0017] and [0053] as disclosing the claim feature of switching onscreen representation. The Examiner stated, “the template used to define the display of the webpage is adjustable.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s reading of Halahmi.

As discussed above, paragraph [0017] discloses dividing a document into portions, receiving at least one portion of the document by a display device, and then displaying the at least one portion. Paragraph [0017], however, makes no mention of “switching onscreen representation.” Moreover, paragraph [0017] makes no mention of taking action, including “switching on screen representation”, depending on the result of judging whether or not the acquisition of definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page, is finished.

Paragraph [0053] relates to step 7 of the process of dividing a document into portions. (See paragraph [0052].) In particular, paragraph [0053] discloses that the template, which is used to construct a portion of the document into which the document is divided, is adjustable. Note, paragraph [0047] refers to the “template” referred to in paragraph [0053] and by the Examiner as being “a predetermined portion construction template.” (Emphasis added.) Moreover, paragraph [0047] discloses that properties of the wireless communication device are mapped to the template “in order to more easily construct the portion.” (Emphasis added.) Thus, the disclosure of adjusting the template in paragraph [0053] does not disclose switching onscreen presentation from a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which the definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page, is applied because the template relates only to a portion of the document into which the document is divided.

Thus, Applicants assert that claims 1 and 17, which depends from claim 1, are allowable over Halahmi.

B. Claims 18, 20, and 32

Independent claims 18, 20, and 32 recite switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from on screen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which **definition information is applied**. Claims 18 and 20 also recite that the definition information is “designated in a markup language document of the page and applied to the **entire page so as to render the page**.” (Emphasis added.)

In rejecting claims 18, 20, and 32, the Examiner cited to paragraphs [0017] and [0053] as disclosing the claim feature of switching onscreen representation. The Examiner stated, “the template used to define the display of the webpage is adjustable.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s reading of Halahmi.

Paragraph [0017] discloses dividing a document into portions, receiving at least one portion of the document by a display device, and then displaying the at least one portion. Paragraph [0017], however, makes no mention of “switching onscreen representation” from one mode to another. Moreover, paragraph [0017] makes no mention of a mode of onscreen representation that involves applying information that applies to the **entire page so as to render the page** (i.e., the recited “definition information”).

Paragraph [0053] relates to step 7 of the process of dividing a document into portions. (See paragraph [0052].) In particular, paragraph [0053] discloses that the template, which is used to construct a portion of the document into which the document is divided, is adjustable. Note, paragraph [0047] refers to the “template” referred to in paragraph [0053] and by the Examiner as being “a predetermined **portion** construction template.” (Emphasis added.) Moreover, paragraph [0047] discloses that properties of the wireless communication device are mapped to the template “in order to more easily **construct the portion**.” (Emphasis added.) Thus, the disclosure of adjusting the template in paragraph [0053] does not disclose switching onscreen presentation from a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which the definition information, which is

information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page, is applied because the template relates only to a portion of the document into which the document is divided.

Thus, Applicants assert that claims 18, 20, and 32 are allowable over Halahmi.

C. Claim 34

In rejecting claim 34, the Examiner stated, “the applicant discloses limitations similar to those in claim 1.” Applicants note that claim 34 includes limitations that are not recited in claim 1 and vice versa. In particular, claim 34 recites the limitations of “performing firstly displaying operation on data of the page without using definition information” and “performing secondly displaying operation of the data of the page using the definition information” that are not recited in claim 1. Similar to claim 1, however, claim 34 does recite that the definition information is “to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page as designated by a markup language of the page.” (Emphasis added.)

As discussed above, Applicants assert that Halahmi fails to disclose the use of definition information, which is to be applied to the entire page to render the page. Instead, Halahmi discloses dividing a document into portions, and displaying the document in separate portions.

Thus, Applicants assert that claim 34 is allowable over Halahmi.

D. Claim 39

Claim 39 recites that an external style sheet and external script in the page are applied in the second browsing mode, and that presentation on a screen is less rich in the first browsing mode than the second browsing mode.

In rejecting claim 39, the Examiner cited to paragraphs [0016] and [0052] as disclosing the first and second browsing modes. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s reading of Halahmi.

Paragraph [0016] discloses dividing a document into portions and displaying the portions without downloading the entire document. In particular, paragraph [0016] discloses that “[t]he present invention enables the user to quickly receive and display each portion of the document, rather than waiting for the entire document to be downloaded before any part is displayed.” Paragraph [0016] makes no mention of one mode in which the onscreen presentation is less rich than in another mode as recited in claim 39. Paragraph [0016] also makes no mention of applying an external style sheet and script in one mode.

Paragraph [0052] relates to step 7 of the process of dividing a document into portions. In particular, paragraph [0052] discloses the construction of a portion from parsed data using a predetermined template. Note, paragraph [0047] refers to the “template” referred to in paragraph [0052] as being “a predetermined portion construction template.” Moreover, paragraph [0047] discloses that properties of the wireless communication device are mapped to the template “in order to more easily construct the portion.” The disclosure of constructing a portion using the template in paragraph [0052], however, does not disclose one mode in which the onscreen presentation is less rich than in another mode as recited in claim 39.

Independent claim 39 also recites “switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen presentation in a first browsing mode to onscreen presentation in the second browsing mode.”

In rejection claim 39, the Examiner cited to paragraph paragraphs [0017] and [0053] as disclosing the claim feature of switching onscreen representation from one mode to another.

Paragraph [0017] discloses dividing a document into portions, receiving at least one portion of the document by a display device, and then displaying the at least one portion. Paragraph [0017], however, makes no mention of “switching onscreen representation” from one mode to another. Moreover, paragraph [0017] makes no mention of a mode of onscreen representation that is less rich than in another mode as recited in claim 39.

Paragraph [0053] relates to step 7 of the process of dividing a document into portions. (See paragraph [0052].) In particular, paragraph [0053] discloses that the template, which is used to construct a portion of the document into which the document is divided, is adjustable. Note, paragraph [0047] refers to the “template” referred to in paragraph [0053] as being “a predetermined portion construction template.” Moreover, paragraph [0047] discloses that properties of the wireless communication device are mapped to the template “in order to more easily construct the portion.” (Emphasis added.) The disclosure of adjusting the template in paragraph [0053], however, does not disclose switching onscreen presentation from one mode to another or that one mode of onscreen presentation is less rich than another.

Thus, Applicants assert that claim 39 is allowable over Halahmi.

E. Claim 40

In rejecting claim 40, the Examiner stated, “the applicant discloses the system for execution of method of claim 1.” Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s characterization of claim 40. Applicants note that claim 40 includes limitations that are not recited in claim 1 and vice versa. In particular, claim 40 recites the limitations of “performing operation in a first browsing mode which makes less rich presentation on a screen than a second browsing mode in which definition information ... is applied,” which is not recited in claim 1. Similar to claim 1, however, claim 40 does recite that the definition information is “to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page.” (Emphasis added.)

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Halahmi does not disclose definition information that is to be applied to the entire page or judging whether acquisition of such information is finished. As discussed above with respect to claim 39, Halahmi does not disclose one browsing mode in which presentation on a screen is less rich than another browsing mode. Also, as discussed above with respect to claims 18, 20, 32, and 39, Halahmi does not disclose switching onscreen presentation from one mode in which the presentation on screen is less rich to another in which information is applied to the entire page so as to render the page.

Thus, Applicants assert that claims 40 and 57, which depends from claim 40, are allowable over Halahmi.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 15-16, 19, 33, 35-38, 41, 55-56, and 58 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi. Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 21, 24-26, 28-29, 42, 45-47, and 49 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi in view of Sai (US 2004/0085331). Claims 10-12, 14, 50-52, and 54 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi in view of Brosnahan (US 7082577). Claims 13 and 53 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi and Brosnahan in view of Chang (US 2002/0010707).

A. Claim 19

As an initial matter, in rejecting claim 19, the Examiner characterized claim 19 as including “judging whether or not acquisition of definition information which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page as designated by at least one attribute.” Applicants note that claim 19 does not include this limitation. Instead, claim 19 recites “judging whether or not a predetermined time period has elapsed from a start of the obtaining operation.”

Independent claim 19 recites switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from on screen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which **definition information is applied**. Claim 19 also recite that the definition information is “designated in a markup language document of the page and applied to the **entire page so as to render the page**.” (Emphasis added.)

In rejecting claim 19, the Examiner cited to paragraphs [0017] and [0053] as disclosing the claim feature of switching onscreen representation. The Examiner stated, “the template used to define the display of the webpage is adjustable.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s reading of Halahmi.

Paragraph [0017] discloses dividing a document into portions, receiving at least one portion of the document by a display device, and then displaying the at least one portion. Paragraph [0017], however, makes no mention of “switching onscreen representation” from one mode to another. Moreover, paragraph [0017] makes no mention of a mode of onscreen representation that involves applying information that applies to the entire page so as to render the page (i.e., the recited “definition information”).

Paragraph [0053] relates to step 7 of the process of dividing a document into portions. (See paragraph [0052].) In particular, paragraph [0053] discloses that the template, which is used to construct a portion of the document into which the document is divided, is adjustable. Note, paragraph [0047] refers to the “template” referred to in paragraph [0053] and by the Examiner as being “a predetermined portion construction template.” (Emphasis added.) Moreover, paragraph [0047] discloses that properties of the wireless communication device are mapped to the template “in order to more easily construct the portion.” (Emphasis added.) Thus, the disclosure of adjusting the template in paragraph [0053] does not disclose switching onscreen presentation from a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which the definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page, is applied because the template relates only to a portion of the document into which the document is divided.

Thus, Applicants assert that claim 19 is allowable over Halahmi.

B. Claim 33

Independent claim 33 recites switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen representation of the first mode operation to onscreen representation in which definition information is applied. Claim 33 also recite that the definition information is “designated in a markup language document of the page and applied to the entire page so as to render the page.” (Emphasis added.)

In rejecting claim 33, the Examiner cited to paragraphs [0017] and [0053] as disclosing the claim feature of switching onscreen representation. The Examiner stated, “the template used to

define the display of the webpage is adjustable.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s reading of Halahmi.

Paragraph [0017] discloses dividing a document into portions, receiving at least one portion of the document by a display device, and then displaying the at least one portion. Paragraph [0017], however, makes no mention of “switching onscreen representation” from one mode to another. Moreover, paragraph [0017] makes no mention of a mode of onscreen representation that involves applying information that applies to the entire page so as to render the page (i.e., the recited “definition information”).

Paragraph [0053] relates to step 7 of the process of dividing a document into portions. (See paragraph [0052].) In particular, paragraph [0053] discloses that the template, which is used to construct a portion of the document into which the document is divided, is adjustable. Note, paragraph [0047] refers to the “template” referred to in paragraph [0053] and by the Examiner as being “a predetermined portion construction template.” (Emphasis added.) Moreover, paragraph [0047] discloses that properties of the wireless communication device are mapped to the template “in order to more easily construct the portion.” (Emphasis added.) Thus, the disclosure of adjusting the template in paragraph [0053] does not disclose switching onscreen presentation from a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which the definition information, which is information to be applied to the entire page so as to render the page, is applied because the template relates only to a portion of the document into which the document is divided.

Thus, Applicants assert that claim 33 is allowable over Halahmi.

C. Claim 35

As an initial matter, in rejecting claim 35, the Examiner characterized claim 35 as including “judging whether or not acquisition of data is complete.” Applicants note that claim 35 does not include this limitation. Instead, claim 35 recites “judging whether or not acquisition of the external style sheet and the external script is finished.”

The Examiner has taken official notice that “use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known....” Applicants assert, however, that claim 35 does not merely recite the use of style sheets. Instead, claim 35 recites switching onscreen presentation from one mode (first browsing mode) to another mode (second browsing mode) depending on whether or not acquisition of the external style sheet and the external script is finished. Applicants assert that conventional external style sheets to which the Examiner refers were not used in this manner. Instead, a page would not have been displayed until the conventional external style sheets had been loaded from the server rather than switching from one mode to another mode as recited in claim 35.

The Examiner also characterized claim 35 as including “switching onscreen, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen representation in a text browsing mode to onscreen representation in which the definition information is applied.” Applicants note that claim 35 does not include this limitation. Instead, claim 35 recites “switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging, from onscreen representation in the first browsing mode to onscreen representation in the second browsing mode.”

The Examiner has stated that Halahmi does not disclose external style sheets. However, the Examiner has taken official notice that “use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known....” Applicants assert that the conventional external style sheets to which the Examiner refers were not applied to render a page in one mode, while a less rich presentation on a screen was performed in another mode.

Thus, Applicants assert that claim 35 is allowable over Halahmi.

D. Claim 36

Claim 36 recites “switching onscreen representation, depending on a result of the judging [whether or not data of a predetermined number’s screenfulls against the page is obtained], from onscreen representation in the first browsing mode to onscreen representation in the second browsing mode.” Claim 36 also recites that in the second browsing mode an external style sheet

and external script are applied, while a less rich presentation on the screen is performed in the first browsing mode.

The Examiner has stated that Halahmi does not disclose external style sheets. However, the Examiner has taken official notice that “use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known....” Applicants assert that the conventional external style sheets to which the Examiner refers were not applied to render a page in one mode, while a less rich presentation on a screen was performed in another mode.

Thus, Applicants assert that claim 36 is allowable over Halahmi.

E. Claim 37

In rejecting claim 37, the Examiner characterized claim 37 as including “judging whether or not data of a predetermined number’s screenfuls against the page is obtained.” Applicants note that claim 37 does not include this limitation. Instead, claim 37 recites “judging whether or not a predetermined time period has elapsed from a start of the obtaining operation.” Claim 37 also recites that in the second browsing mode an external style sheet and external script are applied, while a less rich presentation on the screen is performed in the first browsing mode.

The Examiner has taken official notice that “use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known....” Applicants assert, however, that claim 37 does not merely recite the use of style sheets. Instead, claim 37 recites switching onscreen presentation from one mode (first browsing mode) to another mode (second browsing mode) depending on whether or not a predetermined time period has elapsed from a start of the obtaining operation. Applicants assert that conventional external style sheets to which the Examiner refers were not used in this manner. Instead, a page would not have been displayed until the conventional external style sheets had been loaded from the server rather than switching from one mode to another mode as recited in claim 37.

Thus, Applicants assert that claim 37 is allowable over Halahmi.

F. Claim 38

In rejecting claim 38, the Examiner characterized claim 38 as including “judging whether or not acquisition of the whole data page is completed.” Applicants note that claim 38 does not include this limitation. Instead, claim 38 recites “judging whether or not predetermined user operation is performed.” Claim 38 also recites that in the second browsing mode an external style sheet and external script are applied, while a less rich presentation on the screen is performed in the first browsing mode.

The Examiner has taken official notice that “use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known....” Applicants assert, however, that claim 38 does not merely recite the use of style sheets. Instead, claim 38 recites switching onscreen presentation from one mode (first browsing mode) to another mode (second browsing mode) depending on whether or not predetermined user operation is performed. Applicants assert that conventional external style sheets to which the Examiner refers were not used in this manner. Instead, a page would not have been displayed until the conventional external style sheets had been loaded from the server rather than switching from one mode to another mode as recited in claim 38.

Thus, Applicants assert that claim 38 is allowable over Halahmi.

G. Claim 58

As an initial matter, in rejecting claim 58, the Examiner characterized claim 58 as including “judging whether or not acquisition of the whole data of the page is completed.” Applicants note that claim 58 does not include this limitation. Instead, claim 58 recites “judging whether or not acquisition of the external style sheet and the external script is finished.”

The Examiner has taken official notice that “use of style sheets, stored at a server, external to a client, were notoriously well known....” Applicants assert, however, that claim 58 does not merely recite the use of style sheets. Instead, claim 58 recites switching onscreen presentation from one mode (first browsing mode) to another mode (second browsing mode) depending on whether or

not acquisition of the external style sheet and the external script is finished. Applicants assert that conventional external style sheets to which the Examiner refers were not used in this manner. Instead, a page would not have been displayed until the conventional external style sheets had been loaded from the server rather than switching from one mode to another mode as recited in claim 58.

Thus, Applicants assert that claim 58 is allowable over Halahmi.

Applicants assert that claims 15-16, 41, 55-56 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claims.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-4, 8, 22-23, 27, 30-31, 43-44, and 48 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants assert that these claims depend from allowable independent claims.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 448252001300. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: November 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Peter J. Yim/

Peter J. Yim

Registration No.: 44,417

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94105-2482

(415) 268-6373